

T/IX/M-8  
16 February 1965

UNITED STATES INTELLIGENCE BOARD  
COMMITTEE ON DOCUMENTATION

Task Team IX - ADP Systems Library

Minutes of the Eighth Meeting - 8 February 1965

Members or Their Representatives Present

25X1A

DIA [REDACTED]

CIA [REDACTED]

NSA [REDACTED]

CSS [REDACTED]

1. Because of the short time between meetings, the members were provided with draft minutes. With a couple of minor corrections, these were approved as written.

2. For the record, the Chairman noted an error in the final terms of reference, CODIB document number D-111/1/9/2, dated 29 December 1964. In paragraph II B 1, line 9, the date of the USIB document should read 1963, not 1964. This was noted by the secretary who indicated that the official CSS and CODIB records will reflect this change.

3. The team considered, in detail, the proposed formats submitted by the NSA representative. The team contemplated how cover words (or shortened program or project names) and other similar notations should be handled in the descriptive title item of the file description. It was concluded that the best way would be to put such words in quotation marks when, in the opinion of the originator, the word otherwise might cause confusion when looked at by users of the catalog. The team again agreed that the hardware description should be combined with the program description. The use of the word "type" and the word "format" was considered at several points during the meeting. It was finally resolved that there would be two major headings: File description and program description and under each of these would be

Group I  
Excluded from automatic  
Downgrading &  
Declassification.

-2-

a numbered series of card formats.

4. The group also spent considerable time at several points in the meeting considering how and what dates would be indicated. There have been several dates proposed in the several drafts that have been considered by the team. After discussion it was concluded that the following dates would be used: Date of earliest information in the file (by year and month); date of the activation of the ADP file ongoing or planned, (by year and month); the submission date that the information about the file was provided (by year and month), and lastly an updating code indicating the period of updating or a code indicator referring the reader to further information in the description of the file. It was agreed that the definition of an inactive file was one which was no longer being maintained, updated or consulted and would therefore not be reported. A specific question was raised as to the meaning of the code in column 35 in the format 1 card. The NSA representative indicated that he saw no reason for a three-column date code here but he would check to be certain that his people did not have some reason for needing this.

5. Conversation next turned to the consideration of the method of publishing the catalog. The possibility of producing a loose-leaf type versus a series of bound catalogs was considered. This raised the question as to who the actual users of this information might be: ADP people, analysts or both? It was agreed that probably non-ADP people in some cases would want to see the file description but probably only ADP personnel would want to also see the program descriptions. This also raised a collateral question of how material of various classifications should be handled. Should there be an attempt to produce downgrading titles to Secret from higher classifications or from Secret to Unclassified? It was generally agreed that this would be futile because it would be of no avail for a person to ask for data or a program with a classification for which he was not authorized. It was considered that it would be best to agree that two or more catalogs at given classifications would be the best way of handling this problem. This was felt to be true for both file and program descriptions. All participating representatives when polled by the chairman indicated that probably a large proportion of the file description would be classified Secret or lower.

6. [redacted] reported to the group the results of her checking on the equipment and programming codes being used in interagency activities today. She indicated that Mr. Renninger of BOB told her that he took the listing now found in the inventory of ADP equipment from ACM and that the list of neither programs or equipment is maintained current. In regards to the JCS DoD code, [redacted] said Lt. Col. Myron Yantis, JCS, (x 79360) informed her that they are planning on a six-digit code based on organization as a "unit identification code" for all DoD reporting elements. The first of the six digits will indicate the reporting service or organization. The other five

25X1A

-3-

25X1A  
25X1A

are open for use of the reporting organization. Lt. Col. Yantis emphasized that the key question here was who, not where the report was coming from. When she asked about non-DoD organizations meshing in with this system, [redacted] was referred to Mr. Paul Hyman (x 55466) in Mr. Bowlby's office, Office of the Secretary of Defense, (I&L). [redacted] has not yet been able to contact Mr. Hyman to check on this point. The chairman queried the members on the desirability of adopting a six (rather than a three) digit code for the organization name in the file description. The team agreed to this, pending a specific description concerning how this code will be set up.

7. The team continued to consider elements of the DIA draft, the one provided by the chairman two meetings ago and the one provided by the NSA representative at the last meeting, with the intent of attempting to arrive at a CODIB Task Team subset of elements which would match into the DIA requirements. The CIA and NSA representatives continued to take the position that it is desirable to have CODIB set up a minimum set of required elements. Thus, two major problems emerged from the deliberations. First, it became clear that the team should agree on a consideration (element by element) of what elements of the file description would be useful for the purposes of CODIB reporting. Secondly, after this was decided, then the formats required to provide these elements could be considered. The team members once again agreed that in any event, whatever elements are agreed upon for the file and program descriptions, each agency should only report those which would be of common interest to the USIB community.

8. The chairman pointed out that in view of the still obvious disparity between the various positions of the team members, it might be useful to not consider how the CODIB task team requirements may fit into the DIA proposed file and program description but rather the team should work on the proposed descriptions provided by NSA and when the team could agree upon a list of elements, DIA could then add whatever it felt was required. In line with this thought, the team again considered the file description elements. The following elements with the appropriate number of columns were tentatively agreed upon: Card format number (1); card sequence number (2); security classification of card deck (1); dissemination control of card deck (1); security classification of data in file (1); dissemination control thereof (1); unique file identifier code (5); organization name (6); first, second and third intelligence activity supported by the file ( $3 \times 3 = 9$  columns); date of earliest information in file (year and month) (4); date of activation of ADP file (year and month) (4); updating cycle code (1); submission date, year only (2). During the consideration of these, the CIA representative again indicated a caveat that the agency may or may not agree to fill in these items. It was his position that all that is really required is a list of a general description of the files and programs and a contact point to call or to obtain further information. In view of this position, it

-4-

was suggested that perhaps one way to resolve this would be to consider card format 1 to contain identification and a descriptive title of the file with all further information on additional card formats as required internally by DIA. This suggestion was considered carefully by the group but it was decided to withhold this decision, with the chairman volunteering to attempt to come up with a new file description format 1 and 2 for consideration by members at the next meeting. The group agreed with this and the next meeting was set for 0930 hours, 15 February 1965 at CIA Headquarters in Room 2E56.

25X1A

